

Appl. No. 09/707,225

Amdt. dated June 16, 2004

Reply to Office action of April 9, 2004 and the Interview Summary mailed April 27, 2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-3 have been amended, claim 4 has been canceled, and claims 5-9 have been amended, all to more clearly state the subject matter to which the Applicant's claims apply. The applicant submits that his claims are now unobvious over Chang and Lincke, and that amended claims 1-3 and 5-9 now define patentably over those cited references or any combination thereof.

The References And Differences of the Present Invention Thereover

Independent claim 1 and dependent claims 2-9 are rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang et al (U S Patent 6,105,012 hereinafter "Chang") in view of Lincke et al (U S Patent No. 6,253,326 hereinafter "Lincke").

Prior to addressing the claims, Applicant first discusses the subject matter in the amended claims, and the general novelty and unobviousness of the Applicant's claims over Chang and Lincke.

Applicant's claims pertain only to a novel implementation of a new type of decryption function that operates within a public Website page instead of in the browser that has downloaded the Website page. The Applicant's decryption function allows client users to easily view one or more different private and encrypted messages that are contained in a public Website page in an open Internet Website (Special price lists for the client user might be an example of such a message). A Website page of this type is easily downloaded by client users, and can be one of several pages in the same Website that contain different private messages (for example, special price lists for several different client users). When this type of Website is visited, the first page that contains an encrypted message asks for authorizing keys from the current client user. Thereafter, each downloaded page self-decrypts its private messages that are as authorized for that client user, and transfers them to a browser for display along with any unencrypted page content.

The entire process enabled by the Applicant's decryption function addresses the simple needs of Website creators by providing an elementary method for secure, one-way data distribution over the open Internet, such as that used for private publishing. Those who wish to do this often find that they are not able to cope with the complexity and other disadvantages of today's generally available security systems, which are designed to handle more stringent two-way, secure transactions.

Chang's subject matter pertains to a secure transactional system of a type that is required when a client user needs to see private data (a bank statement, for example) that is stored on a server system in a very large and unencrypted database (the account records for all the bank's

customers, for example). In Chang's system, the process starts when a client user invokes the browser to make a secure request to the server system for the download of a private Webpage. That is the first of several secure transactions between the server and the client user's browser which involve the use of several different keys before the page is decrypted and displayed to the requestor by the browser.

Although a system like Chang's is necessary to respond to a two-way security requirement, it requires a level of activity and expertise that adds significantly to the complexity and cost of that required to simply publish privately on the public Internet.

Lincke's subject matter pertains to a communications system for the efficient exchange of private messages between a wireless client, a proxy server, and a source server. One of the defined embodiments of Lincke's invention is a secure system similar to Chang's, but which operates when a wireless client is involved.

The Applicant's invention provides new and unexpected results that are derived from the basic differences between the Applicant's and the Chang and Lincke inventions:

- (1) A Website page, on its own, can now decrypt cryptograms within itself without requiring support from any other system or process. This in turn means that Website creators can publish Website pages that are each able to display public information to all site visitors and also transmit selected private information to authorized site visitors, and do it all with the same simplicity that ordinary Internet browsing is conducted. This is unlike Chang and Lincke where Website creators and their site visitors must get involved with systems and procedures that are far beyond that needed for normal private publishing.
- (2) A Website page with private content no longer has to be encrypted by a downloading server if the page itself already contains the means for decrypting its private sections. This means that Website creators can encrypt Website pages prior to storing them on a server, and be assured that their Website pages are secured at all times. This is unlike the Chang and Lincke systems where published Website pages are stored on a server unencrypted, and copies are encrypted only for downloading to a client system.
- (3) A single Website page can now contain any number of separately-keyed cryptograms along with unencrypted content. This means that a single Website page can serve its creator in a new and more efficient way by carrying public information along with various private encrypted sections that have different authorizations for different Website visitors. Chang's and Lincke's systems provide only for single-keyed Website pages.

The Rejection of Claims 1-3 and 5-8 under § 103(a)

Claim 1 was rejected as unpatentable over Chang in view of Lincke. But neither Chang nor Lincke, individually or in combination, teach, describe, or make it obvious that there could be A method for automatically operating a decryption function within a web site page as in Applicant's amended claim 1.

Amended Claim 1 provides new and unexpected results:

- (1) Self-decrypting Website pages that contain secure private content for selected site visitors can be easily published on the open Internet and viewed by anyone on any system, without requiring additional security support of any kind. This makes encrypted publishing more practical and more broadly usable than the cited prior art.
- (2) A published Website page which contains encrypted content specifically does not use a browser's decryption services, which is a requirement in the cited prior art. This in turn means:
 - (a) An authorized site visitor can view a decrypted message in a Website page without the onerous process that is needed for secure two-way transactions on the Internet. Such a process is required in the cited prior art.
 - (b) The server does not have to encrypt the private data in the Website page, so it can be encrypted before the page is placed on the server system. This gives it a higher level of security in the server environment than that provided in the cited prior art.
 - (c) Public and private content, which are often associated, can be mixed in the same Website page and displayed in the exact pre-encrypted format relative to each other. This allows for fewer Website pages and better page layouts than that allowed in the cited prior art.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that amended Claim 1 is unobvious and allowable over the cited references, and hereby solicits reconsideration and allowance.

Claim 2-3 and 5-9 Rejections as applied above in rejecting Claim 1

In view of the patentability of amended Claim 1, Applicant requests reconsideration of all rejections as applied above in rejecting Claim 1.

Appl. No. 09/707,225

Amdt. dated June 16, 2004

Reply to Office action of April 9, 2004 and the Interview Summary mailed April 27, 2004

Other Rejections to Claims 2-3 and 5-9

Dependent Claim 2 was rejected as unpatentable over Chang. But Chang does not teach, describe, or make it obvious that there could be a decryption function within a web site page that makes available a plurality of said decrypted versions in a plurality of said web site pages in a web site, as in amended Claim 2.

Amended Claim 2 provides a new and unexpected result:

A Website can contain more than one page in which can there can be one or more cryptograms to be decrypted, which gives Website creators more flexibility and efficiency in building their Websites than is provided by Chang.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that amended Claim 2 is unobvious and allowable over the cited reference, and hereby solicits reconsideration and allowance.

Dependent Claim 3 was rejected as unpatentable over Chang and Lincke. But Chang and Lincke, individually or in combination, do not teach, describe, or make it obvious that a decryption function within a web site page could decrypt a cryptogram when said cryptogram is of any size up to the size allowed by HTML standards for the body of said web site page, as in amended Claim 3.

Amended Claim 3 provides a new and unexpected Result:

Private sections within Website pages can be any size, from a single character up to the size of the whole displayable page. This provides additional flexibility in formatting private sections in Website pages.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that amended Claim 3 is unobvious and allowable over the cited references, and hereby solicits reconsideration and allowance.

Dependent Claim 5 was rejected as unpatentable over Chang. But Chang does not teach, describe, or make it obvious that a decryption function within a web site page could obtain said associated key from a plurality of said associated keys, as in amended Claim 5.

Amended Claim 5 provides a new and unexpected result:

Within the same Website page, you can have more than one associated key for decrypting differently-keyed cryptograms in that Website page. This feature allows the Website page creator to put cryptograms for several different classes of recipients in the same page, which in turn reduces the required number of Website pages and provides more flexibility and efficiency in Website page design.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that amended Claim 5 is unobvious and allowable over the cited reference, and hereby solicits reconsideration and allowance.

Dependent Claim 6 was rejected as unpatentable over Chang. But Chang does not teach, describe, or make it obvious that a decryption function within a web site page provides a means whereby a plurality of said associated keys are entered directly into said web site page, as in amended Claim 6.

Amended Claim 6 provides new and unexpected results:

This feature eliminates the need for secure transactions between the client user (through the browser) and a server system, since the keys are entered directly into the Website page itself. This in turn provides the human operator with a simpler and faster way to enter associated keys.

This feature also allows client users to associate themselves with certain cryptograms in the Website pages, and view only those cryptograms that they are authorized to see. This in turn allows the Website creator to put private information for different recipients in the same Website page when it serves a practical purpose.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that amended Claim 6 is unobvious and allowable over the cited reference, and hereby solicits reconsideration and allowance.

Dependent Claim 7 was rejected as unpatentable over Chang. But Chang does not teach, describe, or make it obvious that a **human operator receives a validity report directly from said decryption function that operates within a web site page**, as in amended Claim 7.

Amended Claim 7 Provides a **new and unexpected result**:

This feature eliminates the need for secure transactions between the browser and the server to report on the validity of keys. This in turn provides the human operator with a faster and more convenient way to conduct the key entry process.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that amended Claim 7 is unobvious and allowable over the cited reference, and hereby solicits reconsideration and allowance.

Dependent Claim 8 was rejected as unpatentable over Chang. But Chang does not teach, describe, or make it obvious that **within a web site page, a plurality of said associated keys are made available to said plurality of said web site pages in said web site**, as in amended Claim 8.

Amended Claim 8 provides a **new and unexpected result**:

In this feature, the novel use of an HTML FRAMESET page assures that the Website page that is receiving keys can make them available to all other Website pages containing cryptograms. This in turn provides the client user the convenience of entering keys only once for an entire site visit.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that amended Claim 8 is unobvious and allowable over the cited reference, and hereby solicits reconsideration and allowance.

Dependent Claim 9 was also rejected as unpatentable over Chang. But Chang does not teach, describe, or make it obvious that a **decryption function within a web site page operates only on the first instance of said cryptogram being found within said web site**, as in amended Claim 9.

Amended Claim 9 provides a **new and unexpected result**:

This feature assures that client users are not asked to enter keys for the visit unless they link to a page in the Website that actually contains a cryptogram. Thus, a public client user who downloads only all-public pages from the Website is conveniently not asked for keys.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that amended Claim 9 is unobvious and allowable over the cited reference, and hereby solicits reconsideration and allowance.

Appl. No. 09/707,225

Amdt. dated June 16, 2004

Reply to Office action of April 9, 2004 and the Interview Summary mailed April 27, 2004

Applicant submits that the novel features of all amended claims are unobvious and hence patentable under § 103(a) since they produce new and unexpected results over Chang and Lincke, or any combination thereof.

The Claim Rejection Under § 112, second paragraph

Dependent Claim 7 was rejected as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Claim 7 has been amended to comply with § 112, second paragraph. Therefore, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection in view of amended claim 7.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

By Ralph Bain Applicant
Ralph Bain
39908 San Simeon Ct.
Fremont, CA 94539-3619
Tel.: (510) 657-6384